



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,556	02/20/2002	David W. Andrews	2322-0495	4278
20350	7590	07/18/2005	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			BORISSOV, IGOR N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3639	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,556	ANDREWS, DAVID W.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Igor Borissov	3639

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 19-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 19-39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Amendment received on 5/9/2005 is acknowledged and entered. Claims 1-18 have previously been canceled. Claim 39 has previously been added. Claims 19-39 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi (EP 0 911 762 A2) in view of Tracy et al. (US 6,550,672).

Kikuchi teaches a method and system for providing services related to access to mass transit devices, including:

Claims 19, 28, 36 and 39,

providing a smart card having a plurality of fares stored therein (C. 4, L. 16-20); receiving (downloading) by a controller of an automatic ticket inspection machine (device) information tables, said tables including accumulation of distance traveled, fares, and number of travels over months including a start date and an end date (Figs. 3, 4; C. 7, L. 1-5);

reading said information regarding accumulation of fare transaction from the smart card by means of a smart card reader (C. 5, L. 17-21; C. 7, L. 3-7), said information further comprising accumulated service points corresponding to the traveled distance or the fare (C. 7, L. 55-57);

calculating (by the controller) a reduction to be added to the stored on the smart card value balance (awarding the best fare) based on said accumulated information (C. 7, L. 30-34).

Kikuchi does not specifically teach that said information tables are downloaded from the memory of the central computer.

Tracy et al. (Tracy) teaches a method and system for communicating information between a central/facility controller and a portable shopping terminal, including: the central/facility controller having a database comprising a *price lookup table*; a remote self-checkout controller; and a card reader electrically coupled to said self-checkout controller; wherein a price component for a selected by a customer product is communicated (*downloaded*) from said *price lookup table* from the central/facility controller to the self-checkout controller (C. 18, L. 18-21).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kikuchi to include that said information tables are downloaded from the memory of the central computer, as disclosed in Tracy, because it would advantageously enhance the reliability of the system by delegating the processing of said fares to the automatic ticket inspection machines, thereby avoiding dependence of said automatic ticket inspection machines on the central computer.

Furthermore, Kikuchi teaches:

Claims 20 and 30, said method and system wherein said mass transit device is a railway gates (Fig. 1, items (101) and (102); C. 1, L. 5-6; C. 3, L. 20-21).

Claims 21 and 31, said method and system wherein said information tables are rail gate price point table (Figs. 3, 4; C. 3, L. 20-21).

Claims 22 and 32, said method and system wherein said information tables are readable (shared) by a plurality of automatic ticket inspection machines (Figs. 3, 4; C. 3, L. 20-21).

Claims 23 and 33, said method and system wherein said accumulated data over a month or a year obviously indicates a start date and an end date (C. 7, L. 42, 55-57).

Claims 24 and 34, said method and system wherein said accumulated data over a month or a year indicates a maximum number of days (C. 7, L. 42, 55-57). Information

as to “*wherein maximum number of days is a multiple of seven days*” is non-functional language and given no patentable weight. Non-functional descriptive material cannot render non-obvious an invention that would otherwise have been obvious. See: *In re Gulack* 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983) *In re Dembicza* 175 F.3d 994, 1000, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The specific example of non-functional descriptive material is provided in MPEP 2106, Section VI: (example 3) a process that differs from the prior art only with respect to non-functional descriptive material that cannot alter how the process steps are to be performed.

Claims 25 and 35, said method and system wherein said the smart card stores fare transaction information monthly (February includes 28 days) (C. 7, L. 42, 55-57).

Claims 26, 27, 29 and 38, see reasoning applied to claims 19, 28 and 36.

Claim 37, said system, wherein said accumulated data over a month or a year indicates a start date, an end date and a maximum number of days (C. 7, L. 42, 55-57).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/9/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that the prior art fails to disclose downloading price lookup table from the memory of the central computer to a remote device, it is noted that Tracy was applied for this feature. Specifically, Tracy teaches a method and system for communicating a *price lookup table* information from a central/facility controller to a remote portable shopping terminal; wherein a price component for a selected by a customer product is *downloaded* from said *price lookup table* from said central/facility controller to the self-checkout controller (C. 18, L. 18-21).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both references relate to providing services to customers at point-of-sale terminal. The motivation to combine Kikuchi with Tracy would be to avoid dependence of said automatic ticket inspection machines on the central computer by delegating the processing of said fares to said automatic ticket inspection machines.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Igor Borissov whose telephone number is 571-272-6801.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Igor Borissov
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3629



IB
7/13/2005